ARCHIVE COPY
Must Remain in
Transcription Room

M-1280
Wednesday 25 October 1967
Big Sur #20
Godbe House Joint Meeting

John? Where's John? And Peter! Come on, Peter--sit down here. And Robert. All those others have heard me enough. Now, Big Sur, now. Now talk, What is on your--what is in your mind? Who was Saturday night in San Francisco? And anyone else, Berkeley? Yah, You're not Big Sur, now. Aren't you Big Sur? Won't you want to come and join, come a little closer?

Bill Parker - I can hear you very well back here.

Ja, All right.

Jim Sedler - Mr. Nyland, I'm wondering about starting a workday here now. After being at the one in San Francisco on Sunday, I'm really feeling strange feelings about it.

Ja, what would you do?

Jim Something simple, maybe.

And how would you remember work?

Jim Well, it would be a help just like the meeting would be a help. We'd be together and we'd be doing something together and...that would help.

Yes, it might help. But you know, when you are interested in physical work and you want to do that right, you become very often identified with it. And I am quite certain that you could have a whole day without ever thinking of the possibility of waking up. I think you can try it, but unless it has a definite aim of being able to wake up part of the time or during the time, there is no sense in it. You may as well have a picnic. It all depends on what your aim is. If people who get together have enough idea of what they want, in the sense that they want to be aware or at least conscious as often as they possibly can and they start out from that kind of a level, then of course they can do physical work together and it might be helpful. But I don't think it exists as yet. It

doesn't exist as yet in your meeting because--behonest. You have a meeting and if at the end of the meeting you ask yourself, how often did I make an attempt to wake up? Be honest about it; you have become interested in saying what you want to say and all during that time you are of course unconscious. Maybe a flash of a moment, maybe because of some kind of a remark--maybe that first has to change. There is no sense in attempting something that looks all right and when in San Francisco it is perhaps a little better because those people have been at it a little longer, and then because of that does without any question, create some kind of an atmosphere--but you're young. And the people who are interested in work are not all committed. Or rather, they still have a little bit of an attitude, you never can tell; maybe it's right, maybe it's wrong. They even say maybe sometime I will find out it is not right--for the time being it seems to be all right and therefore I stick around. But who is there in the Big Sur group that you can say it's part of my life? Not yet. Take it easy. Straighten out first some fundamentals, so that there is an agreement among the different people regarding an aim. If there is one aim and it is understood what is meant by it, then it is possible to meet in that aim and then it's also possible to not have too much friction because people when they work together usually will have friction, and they can find themselves in remembering that they all have an aim and the aim is outside, it's not within them. It's an aim towards which they start to strive. When that is there and becomes apparant, I think then there is definitely a necessity. And I think by itself it will come. Whenever the opportunity has to be there, it will be created. But don't make it artificial. A growth of a group, a growth of working together, also is a natural process and when there is enough aliveness among the members of a group, it becomes logical that they want to see each other in different varieties of--different forms of behavior. And of course they will think about taking a walk, having a picnic out in the woods, or a trip, or working together in building a house, or whatever it might be, But then it is incidental what they are doing and one main reason is that they get together for the sake of trying to help each other to Wake Up. Don't do it yet, Jim, not as yet.

Jim A reading group?

A reading group is different, because there you have an aim immediately outside of you. You know you have a book and you get there with the

idea that in reading you will derive some benefit. And when all of them are concentrated on listening and one person is reading and no one else has a book, so everybody has to listen really quite well, you meet, you might say, in the book. It's quite different. Reading group is quite useful, because it might lead afterwards to the possibility of talking about what was being read and particularly when different people read--not one person, but handing it around from one to one. Then after some time of course you have something to go by that is right. You can also get together not as a meeting, but just to talk and not record it. Last night, this question of a third group, as it were--people who are vaguely interested and may consider that there is something in Gurdjieff but they don't know enough about it yet--they also ought to have a chance to say what they have against it. And for that I think it is stimulating. There are many different gradations in groups, of course, and also a group gradually will change, as I say, when it ~~is has li~~ is alive and of course it will grow and if it actually has life in it--not only a few sparks but really flames--it's going to do something, maybe give light and heat and you all can sit around the fire and warm yourselves. But practical questions about--because there are questions that you have on some of the tapes I listened to, who talked about teachers, heh? Wasn't that one of the tapes? Peter, wasn't that one of the tapes? Who talked about it?

Peter Heim--Ithink it was Bill.

Bill? Bill Parker?

Peter--Weren't you interested in teachers?

Bill Parker--That was the last meeting...

The last meeting I heard, was that a question, or isn't it worthwhile to talk about it?

Bill--Well, uh, I don't know if this question stems from, uh, from our last meeting, but we talked about it at a meeting recently; the fact that there's nobody in our meeting area (outside of Berkely, which is a hell of a long ways away) that we have a feeling gives us some

leadership. We're a bunch of Indians around here without any chief and at times this gets a little difficult, particularly if we have a burning question. The first meeting I think we were constantly discussing what we meant by Work projects and it took quite a while for us to get around to an idea and uh, this is just an illustration.

Doesn't John help you? He comes here every two weeks, I think, or...

Bill That's right, he he...no, John is doing very well...

Ja, and I think that's enough. What is a teacher? Anytime that one person knows a little bit more than someone else, he becomes a teacher. If it is a good teacher, he keeps on moving ahead of you a little bit so that everytime you ask another question he also can give you an answer. But it's such a vague, vague kind of an idea of a teacher. Whenever you read anything out of a book and it strikes you, it becomes a teaching for you. And when you believe in it, you hope it will apply in your case, you do it or you imitate, then it becomes your own. Then that whatever has caused it has become a teacher for you; and perhaps you're grateful. Don't take a limited sense--a teacher is not necessarily attached to any kind of a school or a building or a group of people. It just happens to be a person who knows a little bit more than someone else, but also very little, if he knows a great deal more, he is a bad teacher for you;-~~and perhaps~~ Very often he cannot even come down approximately to the level of the people he has to teach. I think you take a very limited viewpoint of it. And every person has something to give and there is someone who wants to receive. There is a relationship and that one calls indication to someone else for the sake of helping him, and perhaps even the teacher has an idea he wants to share. And it is not dependent on anything else. If he is a good teacher, he is close enough to the so-called pupils or students--if he is a good teacher or an all-around one, he will be able to answer all kind of questions from a variety of different students. And if he can surround himself with enough people so that they want to stay at his feet all the time because they want to profit simply by his presence, then maybe they can erect a little building and live there. And then maybe it becomes a school. And then maybe the teacher will understand them a little bit better because he sees them all the time and mabe be able to see through them in order ~~to help them psycho.~~

to help them psychologically. But all these things are gradations. I very often think that a person, hoping that there will be a teacher, will ultimately believe that even Jesus Christ wasn't enough for him. Whenever one wishes learning, you take it wherever you can get it. It doesn't make any difference whatsoever what the source is, provided it is food for you. When you take it and digest it and it is real food, because it means that you utilize it, that you grow because of it, that person has fulfilled a teaching function. A teacher is not necessarily connected with a school. Mother Nature can be a teacher. A waterfall can be a teacher. As soon as something is stimulated in one, which wants to grow, there has been some influence of a teaching kind. Now I agree with you, it would be nice to have someone to whom you could go anytime, but you know, maybe it is very good that sometimes there isn't a person. For very often when there is someone around, you will ask questions you ought to answer yourselves. And a good teacher will only give you the direction in which you have to continue to think in order for you to come to conclusions; but if a teacher starts to answer all kind of questions you are satisfied and no work will result. And after all, very little is there to teach. Because what is really the theory of work? It is so utterly simple. All I wish to do is develope something I call it an objective faculty--in order to become aware of myself. And in those few sentences the whole system is embodied. That it will lead to certain insights and perhaps appreciations and maybe it will build something for oneself and that then you want to embellish it; and then you want to link it up to a variety of other experiences one has had to get a better insight into what one has experienced--of course that is logical. Then it starts to grow out. But for that it is not necessary to have a teacher. The teacher becomes within you that what is your mind developing and one wishes a teacher when the mind is hungry. And when there is real hunger it doesn't make any difference who is around, I will go and find out, just as if I want to find food of some kind. Ultimately I don't give a damn who gives it to me, provided I am hungry enough and I can get enough food to live. I think the concept is different at least from the way I think you consider it. It's much more important that the little bit we can consider food is being used and at such a time when it is being used, then the person who has eaten it has changed when I acquire the possibility of being able to look at myself more objectively and I have a little bit more freedom because of that, because that is what I mean ~~by becoming objecti-~~

by becoming objective, that then I am not as much attached to my personality as it believes. My mind starts to collect data of a different kind from what I now receive in an unconscious state. And because of that, the mind changes. And I have to wait until the mind changes before I can put new food into it. But if it is the same kind of a mind, at most what I can hope for is that the mind starts to--let's callit expands a bit. But it does not change fundamentally and in principle it remains the same. It is still an unconscious subjective mind. The teacher becomes the mind, but it cries for help. A teacher is very often dependent on what kind of questions are asked by the students, so that he is forced to answer. And that is the process that takes place in a person when there is no teacher around at all. He receives a certain form of information, and he tries to digest it and then puts it to practice. And this practice as experience will teach him. And then he goes out and has more experiences; hoping then that in the direction of this one fundamental aim--trying to become conscious--that he is not going on all kind of detours and wastes a lot of energy. So then he makes the surrounding a teacher for him, Because he wants to test in the presence of that kind of a teacher as ordinary life, that what he can retain for himself and for his own growth. Everybody teaches. All circumstances teach. As I say, Mother Nature. Industrial development teaches you--the rest of the world teaches you--politics teaches you. Everytime I disagree or criticize, I use it as a form of teaching if I turn it to myself, say I don't want to be like such and such because of for what ever kind of reason. This is teaching. Life experiences, they teach, and I will only know when I put something in it that is not the usual way, because if it is ordinary unconscious states, I keep on repeating, repeating as I grow older--I will even use the same kind of a cliche that I've had before. Life experience is important but I come to an end with it. Not only that it becomes monotonous, but that there is nothing more to be done. My interest gradually dies out because there is not enough that really stimulates me and I will die. Hundreds of people die when they are young because there is no further interest at all, and they don't want to be taught. Looking for a teacher you can do all your life, and there will always be a perfect excuse not to Work. You have heard enough tapes--10,9,8,--I don't know how many. You have been able to listen to them; you have also been able to listen to them again separately if you wanted.

You have had chances to talk with John. Once a year you could come to Berkeley to talk to other people. I've been here a few times. There is a world of material already availabe to you. In all the tapes--11/2 hours talk--there is more than enough stuff for 6 months if a person actually wants to use it. You have already been overfilled. My only advice is, use it first. Then if you really are up against it, look for a teacher. But you have to be quite honest.

Now, what other questions? Come on, let's have them. Go ahead.

Archie Jones--I was going to ask why is it necessary to develop an objective point of view, and objective consciousness, if we keep our attention on our body? Our movements?

You mean as far as Work on oneself, that one tries to become observant of the manifestations of the body?

Archie--This becomes the sole means...

No, it's not--it's only the first steppingstone. That's all. It is certainly not the end. It's only a very small beginnings and of course it is obvious, because what you would like to develop is this little I ~~Grpwe~~ growing up, or this objectivity in your mind, or something that starts to register a fact about yourself in an absolute sense. That is the aim and since it is not there and has to be built it is a very tender kind of a thing. You have to protect it and you have to give it the kind of food that it can digest. So if you start surrounding it with all sort of things that are 100% partial, 100% associative, 100% thought processes, you have no chance to develop anything that might become objective. You see? If I want to become objective, naturally I want to become objective to the totality of myself; I also want to become such a conscious being that I am as a whole objective. But there is no question about the final aim. I step little bit by little bit. So when the little I wants to observe, I want to have an object that won't disturb it. And if the object is filled with partiality like my feeling centers the little I has no chance. It is immediately overshadowed, as it were. When it is too close to the thinking process, it can't stand on its own two feet. It is affected by the ~~surrounding~~ thought and I am after Awareness which is not a thought. The surrounding is full of animosity; the little I has a hell of a time starting. And that

is why it needs all the attention I can give it, in conditions that are most suitable, reducing, you might say, all the rest of the world around it to practically nothing--excluding even noises. Why do people go to the country like this? Because they do not like the cars on the the road--they disturb them--or trucks going by. They think it is necessary for them to think or live, that they do not want to have any disturbances from the outside world. When the little I starts to function, makes an attempt at being conscious, an attempt at objectivity in ~~on~~ the midst of a field of subjectivity, and the subjectivity seeing this little I starting up--it's like an intruder coming in, and the subjectivity doesn't like that kind of a stranger there. And therefore they create all kind of noises in order to make it disagreeable.

But it's only a very small step. I start to develope a dexterity in the best means I can and when it is strong enough I can change the object.

Who speaks so softly--Kathy, Kathy Berger? You know, when you speak on the tape, I never hear it. Neither can Peter, neither can John, hen? How come? Are you so faraway from the mike? Or don't you want to speak louder? Yes, it is difficult, but you have to learn that. It would be a very good task, you know, that when ever you wish to speak you step up to microphone and then start talking. It would be helpful for you and also for thoose of us who listen to you, because I think you have a lot to say. Not that you say it--but I think you have towards Work a very good attitude. You want to know. I am sure about that. And when you want to know and you have questions, then you have to have the questions answered. And whenever the question is not answered, you should continue to insist that they answer it. So that you can use it. And if the answer is not clear enough, it is maybe that your question was not clear. Then you force yourself to put it into such words that it is clear to you and alsoto someone who answers. And you have to make sure that the answer is correct for you and that you can take it. And then you apply it, all right? As a task. Still difficult, isn't ~~it--ti get iver ib~~ to get over one's nature. Now, There are more Big Sur people. Come on, Norman.

Norman--The last tape th at we heard, you said something to the effect that the requirement of simultaneity in a work

experience is most difficult. Is that correct? And I would hear a little bit more of that, if you wouldn't mind talking about it.

I think the difficulty is that our sense, when simultaneity means at the same time or instantaneous, that our sense of that form of time--if one can consider it a form--is usually done by the intellect, because we receive concepts of time in an intellectual way. Very often, that what we say is time for us is a distance which we walk, or that it takes time to go from one point to another. So that the sense of time is linked up with the sense of space, and that becomes a mental process. If it is an emotional process I have a concept of something that can exist, but I have no concept of the time that elapses. Because I have no measurement for it. So for that reason I say simultaneity is very difficult to come by, because my mind is not as yet sufficiently capable of conceiving what is a moment, or even registering it. You see, if I look at the mind as it functions now, and I consider the thoughts with which it is occupied, it is that what is going to come and it is that what has been. The sense of present in the mind as it is now functioning isn't really there. I rely a tremendous amount on my memory, and whenever I have thoughts, the associations make the memory of courese very valuable, because I start comparing it with that what I already have had when it is memory it is past in time. It never is the present anymore. And the greatest difficulty I have whenever there is anything that is important for me and that I have experienced, it is now in my memory, I recall it. I cannot bring it back to the present; I could bring it close and I can say it is ~~now in my memory~~, as if I am living it now, but it still is memory. The moment of instantaneity--instantaneousness--is when I realize at such a time I really don't exist in my ordinary function. And that is the realization we talk about when we say there is a moment I will never forget. At that moment I know that I experience something, but if I try to think back to what actually happened, I also know that at that time I was not thinking or was not feeling. I just happened to be there. And that therefore this question of a concept of a moment is not dependent on the different organs that I now use as functions. It is dependent on the level of my being only. And the level of my being is made up of the different sections of myself, mostly the three important so-called centers, which at a certain time when they are complete and together and have been united, they form my Being. And that what is instantaneous belongs to my Being. It does not belong to my personality as it is at the present. Do you understand that, because it is a question of wholeness. Whenever I become an entity, I have an ability to

receive that what is also an entity, and a moment is an entity in regard to time. That is rather difficult, because when I think of a moment I think of a point in time and a moment has a rather different quality compared to the poing in time. The point in time belongs still to time, although it is nondimensional, it can go over into a dimension. A moment will never go over into a dimension. It will stay as a moment, and what is the quality of a moment is infinity, the same way as the quality of a unit is infinity. Infinity becomes known to me when it is split up into finite forms. When a unit is divided into that what made it a unit, as component parts, then I introduce a form into which part of this infinity is formed.--Sounds too philosophical.-- Whenever life is born, life is poured into a body. We become identified with the body and we call that life. But the reality of man's life is not his body or the form in which it happens to be. It is free from it. The further we get away from the living cells, as matter, going over into a spiritual being, as nonmatter (nevertheless alive), or a concept in one's thought, also alive--abstract, not concrete--the more I will understand what is really meant by that kind of infinity--comes closer and closer to the possibility of being free from the form. If I go further than the thought I reach the field of magnetism. Magnetism for me is like a field in which there is a force and a force I only will know by the effect on something. But if I could conceive of a field of force and it is a certain tension existing in a certain form--I call it ether--that then because of that it has a ~~certain~~ potentiality of expressing itself; but it can still be as it is in its tension or force. The more I continue on that particular road, try to eliminate everything that is material, and become less and less dense, then ultimately I come to a point in which that what is now my density also disappears, and what remains is a relationship. And the relationship, when it is based on that what were the component parts, becomes infinity.

So now going back: if I start out with that what exists everywhere and always and eternally and I call that time, then time takes in me a certain form and then it becomes a subjective entity, as Gurdjieff would call it, unique for me, my time. But the totality of all time is endless. You lost me. Try to think about what is the meaning of God, as a totality. When I say "totality", already I start to limit it. But when I say "being" perhaps it is better because it is--and I cannot use a word, because the word again would limit it. That is why it is so difficult to really become religious because not even God wants to be put in a word. And whenever the

word was there, it had to be almost to camoflage what was the reality of God. I think it's quite right, you see, that one doesn't understand this question of momentary relationships because we always think of the time that is nexessary for the conveyance of a certain something as an impression to that what is registering it in the mind. And that our mind at the present time is so adjusted to that, that it can-- has no place for an awareness as a registration. The difficulty in Zen is that the people do not understand moment; and still it is absolutely necessary because unless the moment is there, I am never free from subjectivity. If for me the desire is to reach infinity as God, I have to have at a certain point a ~~life~~ line that goes vertically up, away from that ~~which~~ what is subjective. And that I call a moment--a line reaching to that what is infinity for me. All it has is the contact ~~of~~ with an ordinary surface of ordinary life. But it leaves me immediately when it becomes vertical and goes away from the plane. And when it reaches into infinity of course there is no further contact necessary for that what is where it ~~comes~~ came from, because when it is in infinity the whole line would be infinity and therefore ~~even~~ the point where I started from also becomes infinity. And then I have to contemplate infinity everywhere and always. Omniscient, omnipresent, omnipotent--all of these are just terminologies, but they nevertheless ~~have~~ have a reaction within oneself of saying yes, that I know, but that at that time it is the moment at which life appears." It is interesting to philosophize about the moment of ~~birth~~ birth and the moment of death. They are exactly alike--because both are the transition point from one state into another; one taking on a form; the other, leaving the form. But It is the same. And to see life simply as between the two points, as what is being expressed in that form which we now -- what we now call a human being--life is there regardless of the form. If one can see life at any one time, anywhere, without a form, again one is living in an infinite world.

So simultaneity comes as a logical ~~result~~ result of complete Impartiality. You see, when there is no further attachment, there is nothing to measure by. So all dimensions are lost. And that what remains, of time, is the changing over of the point with a potentiality of finiteness, into a moment, with the potentiality of infinity. That's why I say don't worry too much about it. Impartiality is ~~much~~ more important. Detachment, freedom. When I -- this little-I can be sufficiently free of me, then it can stand on its own feet without having to fulfill any further obligation, intellectually. And then at that time when in that kind of a state it will realise that it is necessary to function in such a way which is not subjective; and when I do not have any attachment to my subjective thinking, there is the ~~possibility of an objective~~

possibility of an objective faculty existing in my mind.

Norman So it is possible to feed the little I with experiences that do not qualify as real Work experiences in that they don't satisfy that third requirement of simultaneity?

Mr. Nyland:
Simultaneity belongs to it in order to complete the triangle of Work. If Work consists at first as objectivity, to become really-- in observation, to become really observant, one has to record facts as they are, in the sense that Gurdjieff means Observation-- as an Awareness--that that has be Impartial. Otherwise I will all the time think or feel that that what I am observing should be different. So you see good observation in the real sense already includes impartiality. And 100% impartiality has to be instantaneous. It has to be. ~~And 100%~~ So the three belong together. You cannot separate them, but they only will exist together when each one of them has been completed to its greatest possible development. So you might say if Observation is 100%, it becomes Impartial; and when Impartiality is 100%, it becomes Simultaneous. ~~So you might say if observation is 100%, it becomes simultaneous.~~ So in order to have Consciousness, it has to be fulfilled that all three are there, otherwise it is not true 100% consciousness. But the question is can I be satisfied for a little ~~time~~ while with 1% consciousness? You see? And when I now taste 1% consciousness and the rest 99% unconscious, I may already have a kind of an experience which is definitely different from being asleep. If I start to Wake Up, or if I go through a period of twilight for myself, or if I have a dream, which is not entirely so completely ~~in~~ unconscious that I hardly exist, something when my dreams are taking place is functioning in my mind. It may not be directive, but nevertheless it's active. So that already ~~is~~ is a state, as an indication that there is something else possible, and when I wake up in the morning then I experience that other kind of a state. And maybe sometimes as a result of the dream or as a result of the body being sufficiently satisfied, ~~and~~ that it is not too lazy and that it is not too tired, or that whatever is required during the process of sleep for my ~~physical~~ physiological body to really recuperate, ~~that~~ And then it is enough, I open my eyes and then I go over ~~to~~ into a different kind of a state. But the whole point is, you see, that whenever I now know in physical sleep, perhaps by dream, or when I wake up that there is a difference, Then the question that I now in a waking-sleeping state would like to reach a state of really being Awake by means of Awareness, that that then ~~when~~ whenever there is already a little streak of Awareness already in it, I am en-

couraged, and then I hope that by means of whatever I have done, as a method or trying, that I will have not only 1% but 2% and 3%. The changes for that kind of a thing going over from one state into another is always gradual. That is the quantity that is accumulating of a different objective kind will in the beginning be completely surrounded by subjectivity, but when it is something that has the quality of objectivity, it is worthwhile enough. But I would like to make it 100%--it may take years and years before it is completely changed. And it's logical, because what can I do, being subjective as I am and only having a thought that I hope I could become objective. And what ~~could~~ can I actually use as material of an objective kind in order to build something that is objective? There are only two things ~~that are~~ possible: one is that there is a little bit of objectivity somewhere in me; or that I know a secret process to convert subjective energy into objective. And both can be used. That what is objective in me is the eternity in myself. Gurdjieff calls it magnetic center, because that is the moment of myself in relation to infinity. Sometimes I call it a point because it is not sufficiently developed, as yet. So the point will do for the time being. It is not a point in time; it is a point in space. And whenever that is now, has the quality of infinity,--that is what wishes to grow out and be free. The second is that I assume that certain things can exist as if they have the quality of objectivity. And with this "as-if" introduction, of course I go through a whole long process of gradually changing the as-if into the actuality. And this is what I call conversion. So my attempts in the beginning to create a little-I are simply that the little-I is 99% subjective. It contains my best thoughts and my best feelings but the actuality of course is not objective because there is no meaning--there is no material for it. So I have to use this subterfuge, as it were, of creating something that I hope can ultimately function like that. At the present time it doesn't function, but I make it as if it functions. Then I'm under that law. I can think I'm in prison when I have the hallucination that I am in prison. Then I act in accordance with it. But anyone from the outside says, "Where's the prison?" Why does Gurdjieff use this term, "living under the consequences of the organ Kundabuffer"? The organ Kundabuffer isn't there. It's only my idea. And because of that I think I live in bondage. In reality I don't, but I don't know it, so I live constantly under this particular bondage and of course I'm tied down as long as I believe it. If I could not believe it I would be God. But this is always that difficulty--I can't believe it. People will say you ought to, and some of them on the outside will say, Why doesn't he? And people are stupid because they cannot help do what they do. That is only another way of saying

they cannot help do what they do. That is only another way of saying they are mechanical; and it is only by the introduction of something that is non-mechanical that a person can change.

Norman--Someone said to me recently that in order to be free you must start by being free.

Mr. Nyland:

The trouble is only that when you start doing that, that you get stuck, because you start with something that you don't know that it is free and you don't even make the attempt, to that what you want to apply, to give it the power to be free. The concept is not free. You start by wishing to do something in the direction of freedom with something that is constantly bound. You see ~~that~~ the ~~difference~~ difficulty is always that something different has to be introduced. If it is not different it will remain on the same surface. The extension of any one of the three centers in its subjective way can become 100% developed, but subjective. How does one change out of--from a subjective state into an objective? By a negation of subjectivity. But that fact has to be realized, that it has to be negated, and ~~that~~ something else has to be substituted that is of an objective kind. As long as a person remains asleep and he does not make any attempt to Wake Up, he will remain asleep--but in his sleep, he can do a hell of a lot of nice things.

How difficult it is for a person to say "I love completely freely". They don't. There is always this kind of little selfishness that one hopes that the other will recognise how much you love them unselfishly. The difficulty in prayer of wishing God to do His Will and I say not mine. And then I start to think about it. I hope He will do this, I hope He will do that. Nobody is free in that sense, and I have no means of being free until I could dig in myself and bring out that what is really free, which is the center of myself. If that could be there, it would be fine. The changover, from that ~~which~~ what exists in shape, to a point is a definite change in principle, because it is a negation of dimensions. The negation of subjectivity will give me objectivity; but there is nothing that will be able to do it because everything in me is on the same level of subjectivety, so nobody is going to be King. All cells are equal as long as they are subjective. It's only the strange kind of a cell that's a little bit objective that has a chance. If I build a little I ~~that~~ which is objective, that I can guide. If I pray to God, Who definitely is objective regarding me, then I hope He will do it, and I pray that He will do it. But ~~when I say "totality", already I start to limit it. But when I say~~

But I'm not doing it. All that I am doing is to pray. If I believe a different kind of food could enter into me, I have to be open to that kind of food, and not close myself. But if I don't make that kind of an attempt, trying to become porous, nothing will happen. I will change a little bit, and that's all. I said a little while ago that if I am here, I stay here; But if I go that way, I am free. How do I go from here to here? Not by the continuation of circling around on the planet of Earth, on the plane of Earth, or to have the thoughts continue to in one's mind in constant rotation. Whatever could happen in that kind of a dynamic process is when I ~~continue to~~ go around in circles, at a certain point it flies off as a tangent. That's different, but that's a different kind of an introduction. Centrifugal and centripetal forces hold it on the circle, in the circumference--but if one stops, the other functions. If this attraction to the center stops, it goes out. That's exactly what happens: if my love for myself stops, I am free and I go off on a tangent to God. The necessity of the introduction of Simultaneity is in principle different from what we are subjectively. If one understands that, then you have, you might say, the secret of why Objectivity is necessary; but as long as one believes that everything I am doing in a subjective world, and if I only improve it, and I keep on thinking a little better, and I have ~~a little~~ more pure thoughts, and so forth, then I will reach the kingdom of heaven, he is completely ~~wrong~~ off. He will never reach it, because there is nothing heavenly in that kind of an attempt. Why does it say in the Bible to have heaven come down to earth or to find heaven within oneself? Heaven is not Earth. It is simply an idea that it is something different from Earth. Why, if it is available on earth, it should say, "improve yourself as much as you can and you'll be blessed," but it never says that. When we talked about Zen a little while ago, the introduction of a moment is the lifesaving concept. It doesn't mean that ~~we~~ one can understand it but nevertheless the principle is correct. But when Gurdjieff says try to become objective to oneself, then something is starting to become objective to me and I have a link with myself; and because of this attempt that I make to create as "I" and I give him the kind of food by having that "I" observe me, the little-I grows. So I build something outside of myself at my expense.

That's a long dissertation on Simultaneity.

~~Norman--It's very useful.~~

But you understand what I mean. Big Sur questions? I thought you had an idea--oh, you hardly belong to Big Sur--you put your hand--you put your foot in at the present time, really--

Gary--But I had a question...

...Shouldn't as yet, no; I want--who are there, who, you are Big Sur, that's right, I know, and are you Lou Embree? And Bill Parker? And what's your name? (Archie Jones) But you haven't been coming for some time.

Archie--I missed a couple meetings but I'm still very much involved, very much interested.

Good. Where's Margaret, who is Margaret? Oh, ja, I haven't heard from you at all. Why not?

Margaret--I've only been to a few meetings.

Have you read any?

Margaret--Yes, ALL andEverything .

And do you understand all of it?

Margaret--No.

And what do you not understand? That could become a question.

Margaret--(unintelligible)

Yes. And have you read sumilar kinds of literature, esoteric knowledge--you have been interested in it, haven't you? Has it ever given you anything worthwhile? Have you been Biblically educated? Nothing at all? Atheistic?

Margaret--Yes.

And that didn't satisfy? You never went to a church, never talked to a minister? No? You're almost unique. But it starts now, doesn't it? Are you reading All and Everything? Which page are you on? Good. You understand about the Arch-Absurd? No? Not even the Warning? The Warning, don't you understand the Warning? The Warning--you know. Karapet? You know Karapet, the one who had to ring the bell, and started to curse out someone else before they had the chance? Have you ever applied it in your life? And does it work? No? You still receive the bad influences from others? You know, there ~~is enough~~, ~~I think~~, ~~in the warning that~~

is enough, I think, in the warning that you could apply it in your ordinary life. The beginning: in The name of the Father, The Son and The Holy Ghost, in accordance with whatever is the rules as usually applied. When I read this I say, Why does he start writing a book with that kind of an announcement, and should I now consider that what I am going to do in accordance with the Law of Three Foldness? Would it be useful to me? Usually when one starts in that kind of a direction of considering why a man like Gurdjieff wrote a book like that and that he gives that as an admonition in the beginning, could he have a meaning with it for me? Why does he call it All and Everything? Why this "impartial criticism", which is almost like a contradiction in terms, because when it is criticism it must be partial. How could he mean "impartial criticism"? Why did he write the book? Look through the contents and see the chapters, even if I didn't, why descents to earth? By whom? Beelzebub, and Beelzebub was the fallen angel. Why choose that name? You see what I mean. How do you read--really, how do you read? Let it penetrate. Read a page, wait. Don't read it mechanically, only for the first reading he says. Second reading aloud. You are not at the second. How often do you read?

Margaret--Every night.

Every day? And enough time? That's enough. All right, the next time I see you, you'll have questions? And you? Come on, It is your lives, it is a possibility of growing. It has nothing to do with even this beautiful place here. And whatdoes one do for the development of one's inner life? And of course in the first place, why should that develop? Because on earth you don't need it. There is enough feeling to get along with the rest of the world, and the mind is quite all right, it's functioning--so why bother with the possible development, or with a nice word evolution? And why consider the question of being bound when I am perfectly happy in being bound? There has to be a reason why we are interested in ideas of this kind because if there is no reason after a little while of course you disappear. Curiosity is satisfied--Well, I know all about Gurdjieff. Well, of course you don't. You have to question each time you come to a meeting, and before you get into the car you say, why do I go? Why should I go? If you ask yourself that five times, either you will come or you don't. And maybe you have questions...Now, Gary, you talk.

Gary Cox--I noticed something Sunday when I was Working at Clara St. that I've never

noticed quite so clearly before. That was, lots of times when I think I'm making a Work attempt--Uh, I think I'm Working, it's I'm not working at all: I manifest myself in a different way, almost as though everyone out there will think "Ah, he's Working", or something.

You mean you consider them?

Gary--Yes.

Really?

Gary--Sure.

Do you sit with a pious face? Once in a while?

Gary--No--it's not that, it's--say, when I'm...

You want to create the impression that you are busy?

Gary--No, it's more in relation to when I'm talking to other people and so that I talk in a certain way or maybe I have a certain look on my face that--it's even more so that I think I might be Working, and also trying to create an impression.

You want to fool yourself?

Gary--Maybe that's what's happening.

Why do you?

Gary--I don't know.

It's very childish.

Gary--Yes.

Then don't do it. You want to grow up. Every time you discover that, you say, oh my it's like eating candy. Don't do it. It's not even a question, Gary, because you know that.

Gary--But it's just that I feel it's a kind of behavior that I'm falling into.

Sure. Why should you?

Gary--Why should I?

Because, No. I don't think it's necessary. Is behavior of a person that kind of law that astrologically you have to do what you do? We are talking of getting away from earth, you know, so sometimes it is quite possible to do something that does not belong to earth, and that does not belong to your mechanicality. You might say it is the beginning of something you do for your own sake; in order not to be bound even by ordinary manifestations and habits. But simply when you see it, and afterwards when you rememberit, you can criticize yourself. Either how stupid, or how foolish; But if you do say that, say it aloud when you are by yourself. Such a Goddamn stupid fool--there I am again, doing the same thing, for no reason whatsoever. See if that helps, and if it doesn't help, you take a little knife and cut a little bit of your finger. That will remind you. But then you have to be honest about it, that you really want to get rid of it. Because if you don't, of course you won't cut yourself at all. You just will be satisfied with making a statement. Gary, with these things it is either Yes or No. I want to or I don't. And there is no use thinking I want ot when I keep on saying I don't. Honesty must come in. Yes or No. No lukewarm. I don't say it's in the Bible, you know--either hot or cold but lukewarm I spit out of my mouth. I say it is in the Bible; I never have been able to find it again but it is somewhere, I know; and it is true, it does not have to exist. If I don't want to do Work, I don't do it. Then I'm honest. I don't. Have made up my mind--forget about it. And if I want to, I do it wholeheartedly. But when I keep on doubting I have to make up my mind one way or the other. So if you dislike this kind of habits--foolish, perhaps, very childish, nonsensical--absolutely not even necessary to waste energy on--then simply say, there he went again. You heard it, you know it. Next time, no. And you say No. You have to make up your mind No. Exactly the same as when you want to say something on the tip of your tongue and you don't say it for some reason or other. You have that kind of experience. When you feel like swearing in the presence of nice society, but you don't do it because you are brought up nicely. Gary, you have to educate yourself, and to introduce what you might call Five Rules of Objective Morality, and then start to judge yourself in accordance with your behavior. And honestly when you are

by yourself and you start to criticize that and say how is it possible that I remain that way, and I wish to be a Man? All right, Gary, no more of that. It isn't necessary. All right? Good.

Archie--I have another question, Mr. Nyland. (Archie Jones) I have g begun to observe, in process of observing, that without assigning them to as you say the so-called centers, that I am struck with certain sensations that maybe correspond to certain functions, but they seem to overlap and seem to--ah, there's no distinct feeling, there's no distinct intellectual notion; but at the same time, rather than try to separate them as I understand this can be done, I've just begun to see them, to watch them and I notice...

What are you watching?

Archie--Uh, when I'm talking about the...?

Ja, what are you watching? Because you now say they are overlapping and you are watching what?

Archie--Well, I'll give an example: sometimes I am doing something and I don't know whether this is Work or not, but I am observing myself in anxiety of some kind--I have to do something, I don't want to do something and then---

And what do you notice?

Archie--Well, I notice that there seems to be a, two or three corresponding- or not so corresponding-sensations or feelings that enter in.

Are you now observing, so-called? And observing feelings?

Archie--I'm trying to.

But you know, we eliminated that. We are not observing feeling. We are observing the manifestations of feeling, observing the state of your body. So you see that clarifies it. I am not observing--I only can state a fact that my personality has a feeling. That, of course, is an unconscios state. Now when I observe, I wish to become impartial to that what is my state. I never will be impartial to the feeling that I have; as soon as I start describing it ~~as a feeling~~ as a feeling of anxiety, or even a sensation, or a state where ~~I am perhaps aflame because of~~

I am perhaps aflame because of anxiety, I am completely bound up with it, or identified. So it is impossible that the little I can even start to function. But the chances are that if an anxiety exists in my personality, it becomes expressed in my physical behavior. Tightening up of muscles, expression on my face, maybe withdrawing with some kind of a strange kind of a movement--you know, almost reflexive--things like that do exist as manifestation of the physical body. I don't inquire, primarily, into the source where it comes from, I only make a statement that it exists, then I wake up to the fact that it exists and no more. This is the way to undo it. At the same time, if there are overlapping influences, it results only in one kind of a form of manifestation. So I don't have to worry about the overlapping. You see what I mean? Oh, not entirely.

Archie--The point I'm making is that they do not necessarily result in any manifestation, sometimes...

Oh, yes. They you do not observe yourself well enough. You test it, find out. You have a feeling, you all know there is something in the physical body that covers for this feeling.

Archie--I'lljust have to watch myself.

That's right. You are so familiar with this, you consider the feeling, you don't know what the body is doing. First find out that it actually is doing something, or that some condition is taking place as aresult of the feeling--There is always whenever you have any thought or any feeling, it is always expressed in the behavior of the physical body. In the mind, as I say, it is a little easier because you always can have a poker face, but even that poker face is an expression because the wish is non-expression. Suppression of a feeling is alreadya tenseness of the body, immediately, even if it doesn't follow in a regular pattern of expressing it in a joyful or in a negative way. So it is only a matter that you don't know enough about yourself yet physically and as soon as it comes up, try to see what it has caused and what the result is and how long it lasts, because it doesn't last unless it is continually being fed: so when it is over, the energy is gone and of course the manifestation disappears. And sometimes it lasts for quite some time without constantly being fed and it still is good for the purpose of observation. Try to become very clear about that, because if observation means observation of physical body, that's what it means and nothing else, ~~because you will have no success with the rest. If would be very nice if~~

because you will have no success with the rest. It would be very nice if one could--there's no doubt--and one wants it in the end. One has to be observant--that is, conscious--of the totality of oneself, with all the functions, but it is a long road. Don't chew off too big a piece, you can't do it.

No more Big Sur questions? No? Linda your wife? No questions?

Linda G. About the requirement of recording: When I am Awake and I am in the moment and impartial then there is a memory or an impression of that time. It's nothing that I do, so I am confused...

Whenever any impression is received by any part of the mind, that will always go in the memory of oneself. Now if there is a difference of recording, subjectively, logically it goes into the memory. When it is objective, it also goes into the memory. There are recordings of fact that are the same, but they are received in a different way and because of that, that whatis the concept of the factis an objective sense more pure and clearer and more absolute. But it is very difficult to distinguish between these two forms that lodge in the memory because we are predominantly unconscious and we always prefer to use the ones with which we are familiar. The confusing thing can only be solved when I do know, whenever I think about something concerning myself, I start to question it: is it so or isn't it so?--that more and more with Work I come to the conclusion that certain things have to be absolute and truthful and that regardless of what I consider myself to be that I will continue to try to be objective about myself. Almost I would say that that what I now record and it hurts, I will put down as truth.

This is the gradual change that takes place, that I receive more and more objective knowledge which for me ~~ids~~ is the truth and about which I do not question because I know I have received it by means of an objective road. Then it is not confusing; it is a little bit consideration one way or the other and perhaps not entirely an assurance and not as yet enough strength that I want to continue on the road of objectivity because sometimes that what I notice is not very agreeable. At the same time the truth will win out. When finally that is experienced as something absolute it will give one, at the moment when it is recalled in memory, a taste of an existence in which one was much more real. Also that one has to learn gradually because one is not familiar with it and in the beginning one shies away from it because sometimes it is a little difficult to accept. But continue with it. Keep

on collecting facts about your self, and after some time, that what you have collected will be more and more truthful and less and less interpretive. Does that answer you?

Linda G.--My question is really about that word "recording", as if there was a recording...

No, the question is the recording is exactly like an impression that I receive from the outside through a sense organ. It records a fact of that what is being seen.

Linda--It happens...it occurs...

Yes, it is there, it is a fact.

Linda--makes a recording, it is...

No, it is a fact of an imprint. Sometimes one says it is like a photograph. I don't like to use that because a photograph is subject to interpretation; but the fact of an imprint of that what is a result of something occurring gives me a fact. Usually it is an experience. The experience is that I exist. You see, it gives me that knowledge and when the knowledge is pure, when it is free from interpretation, it becomes for me a real understanding. And in the understanding I have the possibility of collecting facts as they are. In understanding there is no argument about any fact as I receive it. Don't get stuck on the word "recording". It is a statement for oneself as experience of existing and that is all there is to it! It is a knowledge and when the knowledge is free from interpretation it is the understanding of myself.

Linda--I was confused about it because it was given as one of the requirements for a state of consciousness, and yet it would seem to me that if the other two requirements were met, that that exists by itself.

That's right. It does. When the two of the triangle already exist, the third logically will join them. You are quite right. That is, if impartiality and simultaneity exist, observation is correct. When observation and impartiality exist correctly, simultaneity will occur. But one by itself will not be enough. Observation by itself is not enough, it only leads to a further alertness. But impartiality already introduces objectivity and changes it to Awareness; and simultaneity will actually help it to become a state of

Aw

a state of Awakening. It's quite right. That's why I say, just continue recording, so-called, the facts. But don't get stuck on the word. It is an impression, an imprint, an effect that can be noticed; and when it is noticed impartially it is an awareness of a fact. Are you reading much?

Linda--Not recently. I've been reading for the last two or three years, but for the last couple of months (unintelligible).

Difficulty with the household? The children, so forth? Demand a great deal of attention?

Linda--I found that I was just reading and reading and not digesting what I was reading, not...

Read five pages each day. Try to keep at it. Make it regular. No more, no less. But each time, if you can, in the morning, whenever you have time, devote it to that and keep this up for some time. Don't read it--All and Everything--don't read it in order to understand it. Read it simply to read it. Have you read the book through?

Linda--About 900 pages.

Not entirely yet--you still have to finish 300 or more. Start where you left off. Then when you ~~not~~ have read it, then you have to start reading it out loud, which is quite a different thing. All right, finish it first, and give yourself a task. If you can, read 10 pages, but 5 is enough. But ~~regularly~~ regularly. Come hell or high water. No more questions? No more meeting.

Discussion of Monterey Open Meeting Plans.